

Comments on the [Mill Pond Facility](#) a proposed Torch Wind Energy Project for Newport, North Carolina

Page 5: “Capital Investment = \$180MM - \$250MM”

Note 1: this is a very wide range of uncertainty.

Note 2: See the [NC Dept of Commerce’s report](#) of an earlier proposed NC wind project [Ibedrola, *Desert Wind: Elizabeth City*] where they concluded that “Nearly all of the upfront investment will be with firms located outside NC” and “The employment impacts for a project with this much initial investment is small.” Every indication is that these will be equally true in Newport.

Page 6: “Up to 100 direct jobs during construction...”

Note: there is no guarantee of this *temporary* jobs number, so they can speculate any way they want. If there ends up being only 10 part-time NC jobs they can say it met their carefully worded (unguaranteed) enticement.

Page 6: “Up to 8 long-term jobs...”

Note 1: there is no guarantee of this number either, so this is just a sales pitch. If there are actually only two jobs they can say they were accurate.

Note 2: the only important jobs figure is the NET jobs that result from this project. There is evidence from independent experts that this will be a loss.

Page 6: “Landowner bonuses...”

Note: there is no guarantee of these either. The beneficiary of any of these would be the Weyerhaeuser Corporation — not the citizens of Newport.

Page 6: “...energy for almost 17,000 NC homes...”

Note: this is a deceptive statement as it implies that this project will provide electricity (as it’s normally understood to mean) for 17,000± NC homes. The reality is that it will provide electricity for **zero** NC homes, 24/7/365.

Page 6: “Void of air pollutants and hazardous materials.”

Note 1: this is a deceptive statement as the manufacture of turbines results in [“Pollution on a Disastrous Scale.”](#)

Note 2: this is a purposefully misleading statement as wind and solar energy can not operate without a conventional source of power as an auxiliary. This typically is gas, which does produce air pollutants — so wind energy will typically result in air pollutants.

Page 6: “Price to deliver energy to NC ratepayers far less than retail rates.”

Note 1: this is a purposefully misleading statement as the wholesale price of ALL conventional energy sources are far less than the retail rates.

Note 2: this is a purposefully misleading statement as the real cost of wind and solar are disguised by substantial taxpayer subsidies.

Note 3: this is a purposefully misleading statement as the real cost of wind and solar actually includes the cost of the auxiliary conventional source needed — which the developer is ignoring.

Note 4: this is a likely false statement as the Iberdrola project cited above was specifically rejected ALL of the NC utility companies, as the [cost of the wind electricity was too high](#).

Page 8: “Highly energetic resource for NC @6.5 m/s”

Note 1: This is apparently the hub-height wind speed (in meters per second). Note that the developer’s marketing pitch is a comparison to other [NC sites](#) — *where some 99% are known to have inadequate wind!*

Note 2: Per the industry: 6.5 m/s is the [minimum](#) amount of wind necessary.

Page 8: “NC RPS of 12.5% by 2021”

Note: This factual statement is the nub of the issue. This acknowledges that this project makes sense *only* because of the contrived law ([Senate Bill 3](#)) that the wind energy lobby fooled our legislators in passing in 2007. Classic circular reasoning.

Page 10: “Performed a review of potential environmental conflicts.”

Note 1: This is standard fare where the developer hires a consultant he likes, who looks into things that the developer wants to investigate, and then writes about them in a way to make his employer (the developer) happy.

Note 2: The simple solution is to have the money spent by the developer on paying his bud, go to the Town and/or County, and have them hire an independent expert, who does a thorough and objective analysis.

Page 10: “...perform an Obstacle Evaluation Study.”

Note 1: The implication here is that they are looking out for the military — which is misleading. The fact is that DOD has instructed NC military base commanders to stand down regards to wind energy installation issues.

Note 2: Per the latest figures we have been told, the DOD has had over 3000 renewable energy projects submitted for review for military impact. To date *not a single one has been rejected!*

Note 3: Industrial wind installations are known to cause radar interference (e.g. see [here](#)). The “solution” is for taxpayers to pay for R&D plus the cost of expensive new radar installations for military and civilian air use. This is one of many costs **not** included by the developer in his financial claims.

Page 13: “...Significant buffer between project and any non-participating residential dwellings.”

Note 1: It’s good that the developer implicitly acknowledges that a “significant buffer” is necessary — we fully agree with that.

Note 2: The developer fails to define what he calls a “significant buffer”. Independent experts have concluded that a least **one mile** separation is necessary. [Several studies and independent experts support a mile (or more) setback. This [study](#) concluded: “there is a significant probability of adverse health effects for human beings living within 1.25 miles of wind turbines”. Some others that concur include: [two](#), [three](#), [four](#), [five](#) [page 3-4], [six](#), [seven](#) [LU-15.9], [eight](#), [nine](#), and [ten](#), etc.]

Page 17: Aviation Due Diligence

Note: the aviation study apparently *assumes* normal operations. In weather and/or airplane-mechanical emergency situations, these 500± foot obstacles could precipitate pilot, passenger and/or civilian deaths.

Page 20: references to new state law H484

Note: Despite the implication here, [H484](#) does **not** offer sufficient protections for nearby citizens, the environment, or the military. For some of the deficiencies of H484 read this detailed [critique](#).

Page 20: “Certificate obtained from the NC Utility Commission that demonstrates public convenience and necessity requires construction.”

Note 1: Per the NCUC website here is the [preliminary application](#) for this project on record (Docket [SP-3085 Sub 0](#)).

Note 2: It does not appear from the NCUC website that any “certificate” has been granted. Read for yourself what this November 1st [document](#) says.

Note 3: It’s interesting that the purported basis for such a “certificate” is “public convenience” and “necessity,” when this project is contrary to “public convenience” and certainly is not a “necessity.”

Note 4: Even if such a “certificate” is granted, contrary to what the developer’s marketing material implies, it is only a formality, that conveys nothing of significance.

Note 5: There eventually will be a formal hearing in front of the NCUC and that **is** an important time for citizens to register complaints. Key parties should seek to get “Intervenor” status.

Page 23: “Scoping meeting pre-application package submitted to DENR on August 4, 2013”

Note 1: From what I have been told, neither the Town, the County, or other state/federal agencies were given this pre-application package.

Note 2: The first developer-stakeholder get-together defined in H484 is a pre-application meeting. Despite having the pre-application materials since August 4, 2013, DENR setup a pre-pre-application developer-stakeholder meeting on November the 5th, 2013. Why was this extra meeting (not called for in H484) appropriate, particularly since the developer had submitted the pre-application meeting materials???

Page 24: The Developer’s “DENR Schedule” calls the 11/5/13 gathering a “Pre-application Site Evaluation Meeting”

Note 1: A top DENR management person specifically wrote me that the 11/5/13 meeting was **not** the pre-application meeting (per the slide). Why would the developer believe differently? What do the attendees believe? Why was a meeting held that was not specified in H484?

Note 2: All future H484 meetings should be open to the public. The 11/5/13 meeting was specifically closed to the public.

Page 26: “History”

Note 1: None of these historical wind mills was over 100 feet. The proposed industrial turbines will be 450± feet.

Note 2: Earlier windmills were replaced by modern sources of power — that were *more reliable* and *less expensive* than the windmills. The exact same situation exists today in that most conventional sources of electricity are **more reliable** and **less expensive** than industrial turbines. The only reason we have turbines today is because of successful lobbying by wind industry agents.

For more information about the realities of wind energy, please look at WiseEnergy.org. AWED supports alternative energy sources have have been scientifically proven to be a net societal benefit. To our knowledge, no such evidence exists for industrial wind energy.